



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,662	10/02/2003	Gideon Dreyfuss	053893-5027-01	9955

23973 7590 02/11/2008

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH  
ATTN: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP  
ONE LOGAN SQUARE  
18TH AND CHERRY STREETS  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-6996

EXAMINER
----------

BUNNER, BRIDGET E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1647

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/11/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/677,662	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DREYFUSS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Bridget E. Bunner	<b>Art Unit</b> 1647	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 107-114 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 107-110 and 113 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 111, 112 and 114 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Application, Amendments and/or Claims***

The amendment of 01 November 2007 has been entered in full. Claim 107 is amended. Claims 108-114 are added. Claims 1-106 are cancelled.

Claims 107-114 are under consideration in the instant application.

### ***Withdrawn Objections and/or Rejections***

1. The rejection of claim 107 under the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,646,113 in view of Uckun et al. (U.S. Patent 6,160,010) as set forth at pages 2-4 of the previous Office Action (03 October 2007) is *withdrawn* in view of the filing of a terminal disclaimer on 01 November 2007.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 112 is objected to because of the following informalities:
- 2a. In claim 112, the term "nuclei" should be amended to recite "nucleic".

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 111-112 and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an isolated or cultured cell comprising a vector, nucleic acid, or antisense nucleic acid, does not reasonably provide enablement for a recombinant cell

Art Unit: 1647

comprising a vector, nucleic acid, or antisense nucleic acid. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claim 111 is directed to a recombinant cell comprising the vector of claim 109. Claim 112 recites a recombinant cell comprising the isolated nucleic acid of claim 107. Claim 114 recites a recombinant cell comprising the antisense nucleic acid of claim 113.

The Examiner has interpreted claims 111-112 and 114 as reading on isolated host cells, as well as host cells in the context of a multicellular, transgenic organism and host cells intended for gene therapy. The specification of the instant application teaches that when the recombinant cell is a eukaryotic cell, the transgene of the invention is introduced therein (pg 58, lines 18-31). The specification teaches that a system has been provided wherein the expression of the desired gene can be studied *in vitro* in the laboratory or in a mammal (pg 59, lines 1-7). However, there are no methods or working examples disclosed in the instant application whereby a multicellular animal with incorporated SIP1 nucleic acids is demonstrated to express any SIP1 polypeptide. There are also no methods or working examples in the specification indicating that a multicellular animal has SIP1 “knocked out” or “knocked in”. The unpredictability of the art is *very high* with regards to making transgenic animals. For example, Wang et al. (Nuc. Acids Res. 27: 4609-4618, 1999; pg 4617) surveyed gene expression in transgenic animals and found in each experimental animal with a single "knock-in" gene, multiple changes in genes and protein products, often many of which were unrelated to the original gene. Likewise, Kaufman et al (Blood 94: 3178-3184, 1999) found transgene expression levels in their transfected animals

Art Unit: 1647

varied from "full" (9 %) to "intermediate" to "none" due to factors such as "vector poisoning" and spontaneous structural rearrangements (pg 3180, col 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph; pg 3182-3183).

The specification also discloses that nucleic acids encoding SIP1 polypeptides can be used for gene therapy (pg 50, lines 16-21; pg 58, lines 21-24; pg 59, lines 1-5). However, the specification does not teach any methods or working examples that indicate a SIP1 nucleic acid is introduced and expressed in a cell for therapeutic purposes. The disclosure in the specification is merely an invitation to the artisan to use the current invention as a starting point for further experimentation. For example, the specification does not teach what type of vector would introduce the SIP1 nucleic acid into the cell or in what quantity and duration. Relevant literature teaches that since 1990, about 3500 patients have been treated via gene therapy and although some evidence of gene transfer has been seen, it has generally been inadequate for a meaningful clinical response (Phillips, A., J Pharm Pharmacology 53: 1169-1174, 2001; abstract).

Additionally, the major challenge to gene therapy is to deliver DNA to the target tissues and to transport it to the cell nucleus to enable the required protein to be expressed (Phillips, A.; pg 1170, ¶ 1). Phillips also states that the problem with gene therapy is two-fold: 1) a system must be designed to deliver DNA to a specific target and to prevent degradation within the body, and 2) an expression system must be built into the DNA construct to allow the target cell to express the protein at therapeutic levels for the desired length of time (pg 1170, ¶ 1). Therefore, undue experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to introduce and express a SIP1 nucleic acid into the cell of an organism. Additionally, gene therapy is unpredictable and complex wherein one skilled in the art may not necessarily be able to introduce and express a SIP1 nucleic acid in the cell of an organism or be able to produce a SIP1 protein in that cell. (Please note that

Art Unit: 1647

this issue could be overcome by amending the claims to recite, for example, “An isolated cell...”).

Due to the large quantity of experimentation necessary to generate a transgenic animal expressing a SIP1 protein and to introduce and express a SIP1 nucleic acid in a cell of an organism for therapy; the lack of direction/guidance presented in the specification regarding how to introduce a SIP1 nucleic acid in the cell of an organism to be able produce that SIP1; the absence of working examples directed to same; the complex nature of the invention; the state of the prior art which establishes the unpredictability of making transgenic animals and of transferring genes into an organism's cells, undue experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to make and/or use the claimed invention in its full scope.

***Conclusion***

Claims 107-110 and 113 are allowable.

Claims 111-112 and 114 are not allowable.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1647

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bridget E. Bunner whose telephone number is (571) 272-0881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath Rao can be reached on (571) 272-0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BEB  
Art Unit 1647  
22 January 2007

/Bridget E Bunner/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647